UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,290	10/07/2003	Chle Shishido	501.43127X00	4011

20457 7590 09/18/2007

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER	
LIEW, ALEX KOK SOON	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,290	SHISHIDO, CHLE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alex Liew	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

The amendment filed on July 19, 2007 is entered and made of record.

Response to Applicant's Argument

On page 8, the applicant stated:

[applicants submit that Houge et al ('226) does not disclose or teach measuring of the three dimensional shape of a fine pattern by use of optically detected height information and electron beam image information, which electron beam image information includes information of average slope angle of a sidewall of the fine pattern, information of a ratio of bottom roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern, which information are quantified by using information of a first order differential waveform, ...]

The examiner agrees. However, in the examiner's new search, Hayes (US pub no 2003/0108235) discloses semiconductor image information includes information of average slope angle of a side wall of the fine pattern (see paragraph 42, 90 degree slope is a border value use to determine the slope of the shape is positive or negative), information of a ratio of bottom roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern which are quantified by using information of a first-order differential waveform (see paragraph 20, the roundness is quantified by numerical value). One skilled in the art would quantified the values of the slope and roundness of the shape of the object because the numerical value of the characteristics of the shape of the object can be saved and retrieve using these numerical values, which save storage space compared to storing entire image of shape image.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 4, 8 – 10 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houge (US pat no 6,651,226) in view of Hayes (US pub no 2003/0108235).

With regards to claim 1, Houge discloses a method of measuring a three dimensional shape of a fine pattern formed on a substrate, comprising the steps of

- obtaining height information about the fine pattern by optically measuring the substrate (see fig 5, element 14, 26 and 32 – scatterometer obtains the height information of the substrate, col. 7 lines 39 – 51),
- obtaining electron beam image information about the fine pattern by imaging the substrate by means if an electron microscope (see fig 5 – 12 and 18 – electron microscope obtains an image of the substrate, $I_1(x,y)$, col. 6 lines 27 – 37) and
- measuring the three dimensional shape of the fine pattern by use of the height information and the electron beam image information (see fig 5 – 36 and 38 the image of the substrate and the height information of the substrate are combined

to obtain the shape of the substrate, which is in three dimensional, col. 7 lines 52 – 66)

Hogue does not disclose quantifying the values of the slope and roundness of the shape of the object.

Hayes discloses semiconductor image information includes information of average slope angle of a side wall of the fine pattern (see paragraph 42, 90 degree slope is a border value use to determine the slope of the shape is positive or negative), information of a ratio of bottom roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern which are quantified by using information of a first-order differential waveform (see paragraph 20, the roundness is quantified by numerical value). One skilled in the art would quantified the values of the slope and roundness of the shape of the object because the numerical value of the characteristics of the shape of the object can be saved and retrieve using these numerical values, which save storage space compared to storing entire image of shape image.

With regards to claim 2, Houge discloses a method of claim 1, wherein a test pattern is formed on the substrate, and the height information about the fine pattern is obtained from height information about the test pattern determined by optically measuring the test pattern (see col. 7 lines 48 – 49 – the height information is obtained by scatterometry, which measures amount of light scatter on or surrounding sensor).

With regards to claim 3, Houge discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the height information about fine pattern is obtained from information obtained from scatterometry (see col. 7 lines 48 – 49).

With regards to claim 4, Houge discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the electron beam image information about the fine pattern includes plane information about the fine pattern (see fig 1 – is an example of a semiconductor wafer image taken by the electron microscope, which provides plane information) and side slope change information about the fine pattern (see fig 2A – provides the slope for each cross section of the wafer, which is located by the edge) and a three dimensional shape of the fine pattern is measured by combining the plane information and side slope change information with the height information about the fine pattern (see fig 5 – 34 where the electron beam microscope image information and scatterometer height information are combined to create a three dimensional image, fig 5 – 16, col. 8 lines 49 – 55).

With regards to claim 8, see the rationale and rejection for claim 1. In addition, the first pattern is individually form from each cross section, which is examined (see fig 7).

With regards to claim 9, see the rationale and rejection for claim 1.

With regards to claim 10, see the rationale and rejection for claim 4.

With regards to claim 16, see the rationale and rejection for claim 1.

2. Claims 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houge ('226) in view of Hayes ("235) and official notice (MPEP 2144.03).

With regards to claim 11, Houge discloses a method of measuring a three dimensional shape of a fine pattern formed on a substrate, comprising the steps of

- obtaining height information about the fine pattern by optically measuring the substrate (see fig 5 – 14, 26 and 32 – scatterometer obtains the height information of the substrate, col. 7 lines 39 – 51),
- obtaining electron beam image information about the fine pattern by imaging the substrate by means if an electron microscope (see fig 5 – 12 and 18 – electron microscope obtains an image of the substrate, $I_1(x,y)$, col. 6 lines 27 – 37) and
- measuring the three dimensional shape of the fine pattern by use of the height information and the electron beam image information (see fig 5 – 36 and 38 the image of the substrate and the height information of the substrate are combined to obtain the shape of the substrate, which is in three dimensional, col. 7 lines 52 – 66)

Houge does not explicitly disclose displaying three-dimensional shape of the substrate on a screen. It is well known in the art to display three-dimensional shape of an object after the three-dimensional shape obtaining process (MPEP 2144.03). One skill in the art would want to display a three dimensional model of a semiconductor wafer substrate

is because to show the user / operator any defect on the wafer, so the user / operator may take proper steps to correct the defect.

Hogue does not disclose quantifying the values of the slope and roundness of the shape of the object.

Hayes discloses semiconductor image information includes information of average slope angle of a side wall of the fine pattern (see paragraph 42, 90 degree slope is a border value use to determine the slope of the shape is positive or negative), information of a ratio of bottom roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern and information of a ratio of top roundness of the fine pattern which are quantified by using information of a first-order differential waveform (see paragraph 20, the roundness is quantified by numerical value). One skilled in the art would quantified the values of the slope and roundness of the shape of the object because the numerical value of the characteristics of the shape of the object can be saved and retrieve using these numerical values, which save storage space compared to storing entire image of shape image.

With regards to claim 17, Houge and Hayes disclose all the limitations discussed in claim 16, but do not disclose output means outputting data to a recipe server through a communication line. However, it is well known in the art to send data through a communication line, for example using a network cable, to any type of receiver, such as another workstation or database. One skilled in art would include output means because to send data to another location without having the user / operator carry the

storage device such as a disk to another location, relieving the user / operator of the burden of carrying such devices, to improve convenience.

3. Claims 5 – 7, 12 – 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houge ('226) and Hayes ('235) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Lorusso (US pat no 6,930,308).

With regards to claim 5, Houge discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails to disclose plurality of electron beam image information obtained by imaging substrate by changing incidence angle. Lorusso discloses electron beam image information about the fine pattern includes a plurality of electron beam image information obtained by imaging the substrate by changing the incidence angle of an electron beam of the electron microscope relative to the substrate (see fig 2 – a plurality of detectors are each arranged at different angles with respect to each other, to obtain imaging information, col. 5 lines 50 – 60). One skill in the art would include a plurality of electron beam detectors each positioned at an angle different from each other because to obtain the disparity between each obtained image in order to improve depth map and three dimensional image calculation of the object as compared to a single two dimensional image.

With regards to claim 6, an extension to rejection of claim 5, Lorusso also discloses the electron microscope comprises a plurality of reflected electron detectors, the electron beam image information about the fine pattern is information obtained from a plurality of electron beam images detected by the plurality of reflected electron detectors (see fig 14A and 14B – each rectangular cubed objects are deflectors, which detects electron beam, col. 5 lines 25 – 30).

With regards to claim 7, an extension to rejection of claim 6, Lorusso also discloses a three dimensional shape of the fine pattern is measured on the principle o photometric stereo processing by use of a plurality of the electron beam images detected by the plurality of reflected electron detectors (see fig 9 showing cross section signal received for each detectors at zero and two degrees, fig 10 shows cross sections for all the images obtained, fig 11 shows the resulting stereo image combined from all the individual signal received by the detectors).

With regards to claim 12, see the rationale and rejection for claims 5 and 11.

With regards to claim 13, see the rationale and rejection for claim 3.

With regards to claim 14, see the rationale and rejection for claim 5.

With regards to claim 15, see the rationale and rejection for claim 5.

With regards to claim 18, see the rationale and rejection for claim 12.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alex Liew whose telephone number is (571)272-8623. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM - 7:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alex Liew
AU2624
9/13/07

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600